

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/650,135	08/28/2003	Tetsurou Hamada	00682P0072US	6331	
32116 WOOD PHILI	7590 11/30/2007 TIPS KATZ CLARK &	EXAMINER			
WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ, CLARK & MORTIMER 500 W. MADISON STREET SUITE 3800 CHICAGO, IL 60661			MILLER, CARL STUART		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3747		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			11/30/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

•		•					
		Application No.	A	pplicant(s)			
office Action Summary		10/650,135	H	AMADA ET AL.			
		Examiner	A	rt Unit			
		Carl S. Miller		747			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover s	heet with the corr	espondence address			
VVHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	CORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COM 36(a). In no event, howeve vill apply and will expire SIX cause the application to be	IMUNICATION. If, may a reply be timely to the interval of the	filed mailing date of this communicati 5 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status	•	•					
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 Se	eptember 2007.					
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.						
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 19	35 C.D. 11, 453 (D.G. 213.			
Disposit	ion of Claims			·			
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1 and 3-34 is/are pending in the applic	cation.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from considerati	on.		•		
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1 and 3-34</u> is/are rejected.						
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requireme	eņt.				
Applicat	ion Papers						
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.·					
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) _ acce	epted or b) 🔲 objec	ted to by the Exa	iminer.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in	abeyance. See 37	⁷ CFR 1.85(a).			
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	ion is required if the o	drawing(s) is object	ed to. See 37 CFR 1.121	(d).		
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the a	ttached Office Ac	tion or form PTO-152.			
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U	J.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	,		, , , , , ,			
,	1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been receive	ed.	·			
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents			No			
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	rity documents have	e been received i	n this National Stage			
	application from the International Bureau	ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).				
* (See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copi	es not received.		•		
	*						
Attachmen							
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		terview Summary (PT aper No(s)/Mail Date.				
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) 🔲 No	otice of Informal Pater				
Pape	er No(s)/Mail Date	6) L Ot	:her:		·		

Application/Control Number:

10/650,135 Art Unit: 3747

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-15, 17 and 21-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japan ('141) in view of Kessler.

Japan ('141), at Figures 1 and 2, teaches the overall system now claimed including the solenoid-operated spill valve in the fuel return line. No casing for the valve is shown however the structure includes both a check valve on the inlet to the valve and an accumulator upstream of the valve.

Kessler applies as per the rejection of Claim 1 in the last office action and further teaches an inlet fitting for the valve on the side of the casing of the valve. Also, a seal is shown that would imply some type of outlet fitting on the case to feed the fuel into the manifold.

It would have been obvious to modify Japan ('141) by using a top fed injector as the spill valve in the return line since the spill valve of Japan functioned as the injector of Kessler functions and both were used in fuel injection control situations.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kessler and Japan ('141) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Mizushima.

Mizushima teaches the use of a grommet (412) located between two casing members for an injector wherein teach casing piece includes an indentation to locate the grommet when the casing halves are put together.

It would have been obvious to modify Japan ('141) as noted above and to locate the wiring to the injector as taught by Mizushima because the latter was also an intermittent injector located within a casing having two halves.

Claims 16 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japan ('141) and Kessler as applied to claim13 above, and further in view of Smith

Smith teaches the use of a vibration-isolating sleeve on an injector and the sleeve obviously has a stronger elastic force than a simple O-ring seal would have since it would not serve to isolate the injector from engine vibrations if it did not.

It would have been obvious to isolate the injector tip of Kessler as taught by Smith since vibrations from the engine would have been a problem even though the injection was manifold injection.

Applicant's arguments filed 9/07/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In particular, as noted in the interview summary of 8/1/07, the examiner does not believe that the valve (20) of Japan ('141) is necessarily a proportional flow orifice type valve simply because the valve is identified as a "proportional control valve." This designation can apply to a valve that is intermittently opened by a solenoid using pulse width modulation such that the flow **through the line** is proportional to the pulse width. Such a valve would be an intermittent valve as required by the claims. Furthermore, the ball valve shown in the drawing is not really set up to create

Application/Control Number:

10/650,135

Art Unit: 3747

proportional flow since this is usually achieved via a needle valve or spool valve. To overcome the rejection the examiner requested the submission of a translation of the reference, but the applicant has not supplied such a translation. Therefore, the examiner has maintained his original interpretation of the teachings of Japan ('141).

With respect to the teaching within Kessler applied against Claim 13, Kessler teaches a casing created by elements (22) and (26). These elements surround an intermittently operating fuel valve. The housing and valve element of such a valve are already clearly shown in Figure 2 of Japan (141). It would have been obvious to enclose the valve (20) within a casing as taught by Kessler.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10/650,135

Art Unit: 3747

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carl S. Miller whose telephone number is 703-308-2653. The examiner can normally be reached on MTWTHF.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Cronin, can be reached at 571-272-4536. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Carl S. Miller/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 3747